## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS DALLAS DIVISION

SALVADOR CORREAS	§	
(TDCJ No. 1481981),	§	
	§	
Petitioner,	§	
	§	
V.	§	No. 3:14-cv-4311-K-BN
	§	
WILLIAM STEPHENS, Director	§	
Texas Department of Criminal Justice	§	
Correctional Institutions Division,	§	
	§	
Respondent.	§	

## FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATION OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

This case has been referred to the United States magistrate judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The undersigned magistrate judge issues the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendation concerning Petitioner Salvador Correas's motion for leave to proceed *in forma pauperis*, *see* Dkt. No. 4, pursuant to Rule 2(a)(4)(b) of this Court's Miscellaneous Order No. 6.

## **Background**

Petitioner has filed an application for federal habeas relief concerning his 2008 conviction in the 204 th Judicial District Court of Dallas County, Texas for attempted aggravated sexual assault, burglary, and attempted sexual assault. See Dkt. No. 3. Accompanying the application is Petitioner's motion for leave to proceed in forma pauperis [Dkt. No. 4], to which he attached his inmate trust account certification, see id. at 3. That certification establishes that, as of December 3, 2014, Petitioner's current

inmate trust account balance was \$1,878.40 and the average six month account balance was \$2,100.27.

## Legal Standards and Analysis

28 U.S.C. § 1915(a) sets forth the standards governing in forma pauperis motions. The district court may authorize the commencement of a civil action without the prepayment of fees or costs "by a person who submits an affidavit ... that [he or she] is unable to pay such fees or give security therefor." 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(1).

The Court must examine the financial condition of the applicant in order to determine whether the payment of fees would "cause [an] undue financial hardship." *Prows v. Kastner*, 842 F.2d 138, 140 (5th Cir. 1988). The amount of money available to inmates in their prison trust account or from other sources should be considered. *See id.*; *Simon v. Quarterman*, No. 3:07-cv-1793-D, 2007 WL 4167943, at \*1 (N.D. Tex. Nov. 20, 2007).

The filing fee for a habeas case is \$5.00. See 28 U.S.C. § 1914(a). As stated above, as of December 3, 2014, the average six month balance in Petitioner's inmate trust account was \$2,100.27. In actions brought pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2241 and 2255, this Court routinely grants leave to proceed in forma pauperis if "the average six month balance of [an] inmate['s] trust account and other financial resources are less than Fifty Dollars." N.D. Tex. MISC. ORDER NO. 6, Rule 2a(4)(a)(ii) (May 5, 2005). Because Petitioner's average six month balance is more than 42 times that amount, the undersigned concludes that Petitioner is able to pay the filing fee without causing undue financial hardship.

Recommendation

Petitioner's application to proceed in forma pauperis [Dkt. No. 4] should be

denied. If Petitioner fails to pay the \$5.00 statutory filing fee within 21 days after any

order adopting this recommendation, Petitioner's case should be dismissed without

further notice.

A copy of these findings, conclusions, and recommendation shall be served on all

parties in the manner provided by law. Any party who objects to any part of these

findings, conclusions, and recommendation must file specific written objections within

14 days after being served with a copy. See 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b).

In order to be specific, an objection must identify the specific finding or

recommendation to which objection is made, state the basis for the objection, and

specify the place in the magistrate judge's findings, conclusions, and recommendation

where the disputed determination is found. An objection that merely incorporates by

reference or refers to the briefing before the magistrate judge is not specific. Failure

to file specific written objections will bar the aggrieved party from appealing the

factual findings and legal conclusions of the magistrate judge that are accepted or

adopted by the district court, except upon grounds of plain error. See Douglass v.

United Services Auto. Ass'n, 79 F.3d 1415, 1417 (5th Cir. 1996).

DATED: December 11, 2014

DAVID L. HORAN

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

-3-